

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA1
2
3
TYRONE NOEL NUNN,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 3:23-cv-00573-ART-CSD

v.

5
CARSON CITY, NEVADA, et al.,6
Defendants.
7

ORDER

8 This action began with a civil-rights complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 filed
9 by state prisoner Tyrone Nunn. (ECF No. 1-1). But Nunn neither paid the \$402
10 filing fee nor applied to proceed *in forma pauperis* ("IFP") in this action. (See ECF
11 No. 1). So on November 28, 2023, this Court ordered Nunn to either pay the filing
12 fee or apply for IFP status by January 29, 2024. (ECF No. 3). The Court warned
13 Nunn this action could be dismissed without prejudice if he failed to timely
14 comply. (*Id.* at 2). Before the deadline expired, Nunn filed a document titled
15 "Initiation of Actions," which is a collection of handwritten statutes, a vague
16 "affidavit" about exhaustion of administrative remedies, multiple *ex parte*
17 requests for the appointment of counsel, prison classification papers, documents
18 from one of Nunn's state criminal cases, an incomplete IFP application, and a
19 proposed summons. (ECF Nos. 4, 5). He also filed a document that appears to be
20 a motion to consolidate several cases and includes several more requests for
21 appointment of counsel and affidavits. (ECF No. 6). Nunn has filed the same
22 collections of papers in several of his other actions. (See ECF No. 4 at 2).

23 Despite Nunn's many papers, he still has not paid the full \$402 filing fee
24 or filed a complete IFP application. Moreover, according to the Nevada
25 Department of Corrections inmate database, Nunn has been transferred to High
26 Desert State Prison. But Nunn has not filed his updated address with the Court
27 in compliance with Nevada Local Rule of Practice IA 3-1. For the reasons
28 discussed below, this action is dismissed without prejudice.

1 **I. DISCUSSION**

2 District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and “[i]n
 3 the exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where
 4 appropriate . . . dismissal” of a case. *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los
 5 Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action based
 6 on a party’s failure to obey a court order or comply with local rules. *See Carey v.
 7 King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (affirming dismissal for failure to
 8 comply with local rule requiring *pro se* plaintiffs to keep court apprised of
 9 address); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987)
 10 (dismissal for failure to comply with court order). In determining whether to
 11 dismiss an action on one of these grounds, the Court must consider: (1) the
 12 public’s interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the Court’s need to
 13 manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy
 14 favoring disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic
 15 alternatives. *See In re Phenylpropanolamine Prod. Liab. Litig.*, 460 F.3d 1217,
 16 1226 (9th Cir. 2006) (quoting *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 130).

17 The first two factors, the public’s interest in expeditiously resolving this
 18 litigation and the Court’s interest in managing its docket, weigh in favor of
 19 dismissal of Nunn’s claims. The third factor, risk of prejudice to defendants, also
 20 weighs in favor of dismissal because a presumption of injury arises from the
 21 occurrence of unreasonable delay in filing a pleading ordered by the court or
 22 prosecuting an action. *See Anderson v. Air West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir.
 23 1976). The fourth factor—the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their
 24 merits—is greatly outweighed by the factors favoring dismissal.

25 The fifth factor requires the Court to consider whether less drastic
 26 alternatives can be used to correct the party’s failure that brought about the
 27 Court’s need to consider dismissal. *See Yourish v. Cal. Amplifier*, 191 F.3d 983,
 28 992 (9th Cir. 1999) (explaining that considering less drastic alternatives *before*

1 the party has disobeyed a court order does not satisfy this factor); *accord*
2 *Pagtalunan v. Galaza*, 291 F.3d 639, 643 & n.4 (9th Cir. 2002). Courts “need not
3 exhaust every sanction short of dismissal before finally dismissing a case, but
4 must explore possible and meaningful alternatives.” *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779
5 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986). Because this action cannot realistically proceed
6 until Nunn either pays the filing fee or files a complete IFP application, the only
7 alternative is to enter a second order setting another deadline. But the reality of
8 repeating an ignored order is that it often only delays the inevitable and
9 squanders the Court’s finite resources.

10 The circumstances here do not indicate this case will be an exception.
11 There is no indication that Nunn did not receive the Court’s order or could not
12 file a complete IFP application. Rather, the collections of documents that Nunn
13 has filed show he is either unable or unwilling to comply with the Court’s orders.
14 And Nunn has not filed his updated address with the Court despite being
15 transferred to a different prison. Setting another deadline is not a meaningful
16 alternative given these circumstances. So the fifth factor favors dismissal.

17 **I. CONCLUSION**

18 Having thoroughly considered these dismissal factors, the Court finds that
19 they weigh in favor of dismissal. It is therefore ordered that this action is
20 dismissed without prejudice based on Tyrone Nunn’s failure to either pay the
21 \$402 filing fee or file a complete application to proceed *in forma pauperis* in
22 compliance with this Court’s November 28, 2023, order. The Clerk of Court is
23 directed to enter judgment accordingly and close this case. No other documents
24 may be filed in this now-closed case. If Tyrone Nunn wishes to pursue his claims,
25 he must file a complaint in a new case and either pay the filing fee or file a
26 complete application to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

27 It is further ordered that Nunn’s motions and applications for various relief
28 (ECF Nos. 4, 5, 6) are denied as moot.

1 It is further ordered that the Clerk of the Court will send Nunn a courtesy
2 copy of this order by electronically sending the same to High Desert State Prison's
3 law library.

4

5

6 DATED THIS 29th day of April 2024.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28



ANNE R. TRAUM
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE